

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

Laurence M. Rosen, Esq.
609 W. South Orange Avenue, Suite 2P
South Orange, NJ 07079
Tel: (973) 313-1887
Fax: (973) 833-0399
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

ROBERT STIRES, Individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ECO SCIENCE SOLUTIONS, INC., JEFFERY
TAYLOR, and DON LEE TAYLOR,

Defendants.

Case No.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL
SECURITIES LAWS**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Robert Stires (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated, by Plaintiff’s undersigned attorneys, for Plaintiff’s complaint against Defendants (defined below), alleges the following based upon personal knowledge as to Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s own acts, and information and belief as to all other matters, based upon, inter alia, the investigation conducted by and through Plaintiff’s attorneys, which included, among other things, a review of the defendants’ public documents, conference calls and announcements made by defendants, United States Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) filings, wire and press releases published by and regarding Eco Science Solutions, Inc. (“Eco Science Solutions” or the “Company”), analysts’ reports and advisories about the Company, and information readily obtainable on the Internet. Plaintiff believes that substantial

evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of all persons and entities, other than Defendants, who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of Eco Science Solutions from May 1, 2017 through May 19, 2017, both dates inclusive (the “Class Period”). Plaintiff seeks to recover compensable damages caused by Defendants’ violations of the federal securities laws and to pursue remedies under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. The claims asserted herein arise under and pursuant to §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §§78j(b) and 78t(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the SEC (17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5).

3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §27 of the Exchange Act.

4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to §27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §78aa) and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) as the misleading statements entered into and the subsequent damages took place within this district.

5. In connection with the acts, conduct and other wrongs alleged in this Complaint, Defendants, directly or indirectly, used the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, including but not limited to, the United States mail, interstate telephone communications and the facilities of the national securities exchange.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff, as set forth in the accompanying Certification, purchased Eco Science Solutions securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosure. Plaintiff is a citizen of New Jersey.

7. Defendant Eco Science Solutions is a technology-focused company that provides solutions for the health and wellness industry. The Company is incorporated in Nevada and its principal executive offices are located at 1135 Makawao Avenue, Suite 103-188 Makawao, Hawaii. The Company's common stock is traded on OTCQB Venture Market ("OTC") under the ticker symbol "ESSI."

8. Defendant Jeffery Taylor ("J. Taylor") has been the Company's President, Chief Executive Officer, Secretary and Director throughout the Class Period.

9. Defendant Don Lee Taylor ("D. Taylor") the Company's Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer and Director ("CFO") throughout the Class Period.

10. Defendants J. Taylor and D. Taylor are sometimes referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants."

11. Each of the Individual Defendants:

- (a) directly participated in the management of the Company;
- (b) was directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the Company at the highest levels;
- (c) was privy to confidential proprietary information concerning the Company and its business and operations;
- (d) was directly or indirectly involved in drafting, producing, reviewing and/or disseminating the false and misleading statements and information alleged herein;

- (e) was directly or indirectly involved in the oversight or implementation of the Company's internal controls;
- (f) was aware of or recklessly disregarded the fact that the false and misleading statements were being issued concerning the Company; and/or
- (g) approved or ratified these statements in violation of the federal securities laws.

12. The Company is liable for the acts of the Individual Defendants and its employees under the doctrine of *respondeat superior* and common law principles of agency because all of the wrongful acts complained of herein were carried out within the scope of their employment.

13. The scienter of the Individual Defendants and other employees and agents of the Company is similarly imputed to the Company under *respondeat superior* and agency principles.

14. The Company and the Individual Defendants are referred to herein, collectively, as the "Defendants."

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Materially False and Misleading Statements

15. On May 1, 2017, the Company filed a Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended January 31, 2017 with the SEC (the "2016 10-K"), which provided the Company's year-end financial results and position. The 2016 10-K was signed by Defendants J. Taylor and D. Taylor. The 2016 10-K also contained signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("SOX") by Defendants J. Taylor and D. Taylor attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company's internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

16. The Company stated the following with regards to its plan for strategic acquisitions:

The following is to provide a road-map for how the Company intends to prepare for and generate revenues, along with the costs associated to do so. Eco Science Solutions' core Initiatives are centered on five main areas: 1) continued consumer and enterprise technology investment, 2) continued product development through Scientific Research and Development; 3) inventory build for distribution, and 4) *strategic acquisitions that provide an accelerated time-frame to secure market share*; 5) development of Sales, Customer and Finance personnel depth to support accelerated revenue growth.

Strategic acquisitions – Due to various hyper-growth trends in segments of the holistic health and wellness category, Eco Science Solutions believes that it will be presented with unique investment and acquisition opportunities that are both synergistic and accretive to the Company. The Management Team has already identified several candidates. The Company has not budgeted an exact dollar amount for investment purposes in Strategic acquisitions over the next 12-month period.

(Emphasis added).

17. On May 5, 2017, the Company announced the proposed acquisition of Ga-Du Bank, Inc, stating in relevant part:

SOURCE: Eco Science Solutions, Inc.
May 05, 2017 08:10 ET

Eco Science Solutions, Inc. Signs Letter of Intent to Acquire Specialty Banking Operation

MAUI, HI--(Marketwired - May 5, 2017) - Eco Science Solutions, Inc. (OTCQB: ESSI), an eco-technology Company providing solutions to the multi-billion-dollar health, wellness and alternative medicine industry, today announced that it has signed a Letter of Intent with Ga-Du Bank, Inc. for the purpose of acquiring full ownership of the Bank in a stock and cash transaction.

Upon the closing of the transaction, ESSI will operate the Bank as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Eco Science Solutions, Inc. ESSI will own and operate a financial banking division providing payment processing, cash management and financial services to its customers in the cannabis industry.

Additionally, the Bank's principals have engaged with prospects in the marketplace whom have made expressions of interest, along with preliminary commitments to deposit sums between Three-Hundred and Six-Hundred Million Dollars (\$300,000,000 and \$600,000,000). These amounts are currently being

projected to be deposited within the first sixty to one-hundred-eighty days following the acquisition of the Bank by ESSI.

“All parties involved are enthusiastic about the Bank’s potential to financially serve the cannabis marketplace. Current business owners working in medical marijuana are doing a tremendous job, but are truly in need of formal banking services so they can soundly manage their business finances,” stated John Lewis, who is both the current president of the Bank and a Governor of the Central Bank of SCNRFP. Mr. Lewis continued with, “By combining Ga-Du Bank with Eco Science Solutions, we see how our synergies will create an important financial institution to serve a category that is in need of a fully integrated vertical product suite.”

“Our entire team is thrilled by the prospect of the acquisition of the Ga-Du Bank by ESSI,” said Andy Tucker, Senior Advisor to of Ga-Du Bank. Mr. Tucker continued, “We believe that in joining forces with the ESSI team, we can deliver a comprehensive suite of financial products that addresses the current needs of currently what is a cash-driven industry, allowing ESSI to become a break-out leader for the sector.”

“It has been our vision from day one that, in order to fully service the cannabis industry and execute on our business plan, we needed to be creative in securing and offering a banking platform that further differentiates us from everyone in our category,” stated Jeff Taylor, Chief Executive Officer of Eco Science Solutions, Inc. Mr. Taylor continued, “The deal with Ga-Du Bank is a game-changer for not only ESSI, but everyone in the cannabis industry. This new division of our Company will put us years ahead of our goal to create a full-service marketplace among growers, suppliers, distributors, retailers and consumers.”

18. The statements referenced in ¶¶ 15 - 17 above were materially false and/or misleading because they misrepresented and failed to disclose the following adverse facts pertaining to the Company’s business, operational and financial results, which were known to Defendants or recklessly disregarded by them. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) the Company’s plan for strategic acquisitions lacked veracity; and (2) as a result, Defendants’ statements about the Company’s business, operations and prospects were materially false and misleading and/or lacked a reasonable bases at all relevant times.

The Truth Emerges

19. On May 22, 2017, the SEC temporarily halted trading in the Company's securities, stating in relevant part:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 80737 / May 19, 2017

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") announced the temporary suspension, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), of trading in the securities of Eco Science Solutions, Inc. ("ESSI"), of Malaweia, Hawaii at 9:30 a.m. EDT on May 22, 2017, and terminating at 11:59 p.m. EDT on June 5, 2017.

The Commission temporarily suspended trading in the securities of ESSI because of concerns regarding the accuracy and adequacy of publicly disseminated information concerning, among other things, ESSI's proposed acquisition of Ga-Du Bank, Inc. This order was entered pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act).

The Commission acknowledges FINRA's assistance in this matter.

The Commission cautions broker-dealers, shareholders, and prospective purchasers that they should carefully consider the foregoing information along with all other currently available information and any information subsequently issued by the company.

Further, brokers and dealers should be alert to the fact that, pursuant to Rule 15c2-11 under the Exchange Act, at the termination of the trading suspension, no quotation may be entered unless and until they have strictly complied with all of the provisions of the rule. If any broker or dealer has any questions as to whether or not he has complied with the rule, he should not enter any quotation but immediately contact the staff in the Division of Trading and Markets, Office of Interpretation and Guidance, at (202) 551-5777. If any broker or dealer is uncertain as to what is required by Rule 15c2-11, he should refrain from entering quotations relating to ESSI's securities until such time as he has familiarized himself with the rule and is certain that all of its provisions have been met. If any broker or dealer enters any quotation which is in violation of the rule, the Commission will consider the need for prompt enforcement action.

If any broker-dealer or other person has any information which may relate to this matter, they should immediately contact Gerald Gross, Assistant Regional Director, New York Regional Office at (212) 336-0085 or Michael D. Paley, Assistant Regional Director, New York Regional Office at (212) 336-0145.

20. To date, trading the Company's securities remains halted, rendering the Company's securities illiquid and virtually worthless thereby damaging investors.

21. As a result of Defendants' wrongful acts and omissions, and the precipitous decline in the market value of the Company's securities, Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered significant losses and damages.

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

22. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a Class, consisting of all those who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of Eco Science Solutions during the Class Period (the "Class"); and were damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosure. Excluded from the Class are Defendants herein, the officers and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

23. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, the Company's securities were actively traded on the OTC. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can be ascertained only through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are hundreds or thousands of members in the proposed Class. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by the Company or its transfer agent and may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, using the form of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class actions.

24. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as all members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in violation of federal law that is complained of herein.

25. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class and securities litigation. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to or in conflict with those of the Class.

26. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

- a. whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as alleged herein;
- b. whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the financial condition, business, operations, and management of the Company;
- c. whether Defendants' public statements to the investing public during the Class Period omitted material facts necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading;
- d. whether the Individual Defendants caused the Company to issue false and misleading SEC filings and public statements during the Class Period;
- e. whether Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and misleading SEC filings and public statements during the Class Period;
- f. whether the prices of the Company's securities during the Class Period were artificially inflated because of the Defendants' conduct complained of herein; and

- g. whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, what is the proper measure of damages.

27. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is impracticable. Furthermore, as the damages suffered by individual Class members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it impossible for members of the Class to individually redress the wrongs done to them. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

28. Plaintiff will rely, in part, upon the presumption of reliance established by the fraud-on-the-market doctrine in that:

- a. Defendants made public misrepresentations or failed to disclose material facts during the Class Period;
- b. the omissions and misrepresentations were material;
- c. the Company's securities are traded in efficient markets;
- d. the Company's securities were liquid and traded with moderate to heavy volume during the Class Period;
- e. the Company traded on the OTC and was covered by multiple analysts;
- f. the misrepresentations and omissions alleged would tend to induce a reasonable investor to misjudge the value of the Company's securities; and
- g. Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased and/or sold the Company's securities between the time the Defendants failed to disclose or misrepresented material facts and the time the true facts were disclosed, without knowledge of the omitted or misrepresented facts.

29. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to a presumption of reliance upon the integrity of the market.

30. Alternatively, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to the presumption of reliance established by the Supreme Court in *Affiliated Ute Citizens of the State of Utah v. United States*, 406 U.S. 128, 92 S. Ct. 2430 (1972), as Defendants omitted material information in their Class Period statements in violation of a duty to disclose such information, as detailed above.

COUNT I

Violation of Section 10(b) of The Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Against All Defendants

31. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

32. This Count is asserted against the Company and the Individual Defendants and is based upon Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the SEC.

33. During the Class Period, the Company and the Individual Defendants, individually and in concert, directly or indirectly, disseminated or approved the false statements specified above, which they knew or deliberately disregarded were misleading in that they contained misrepresentations and failed to disclose material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

34. The Company and the Individual Defendants violated §10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule 10b-5 in that they: employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud; made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or

engaged in acts, practices and a course of business that operated as a fraud or deceit upon plaintiff and others similarly situated in connection with their purchases of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

35. The Company and the Individual Defendants acted with scienter in that they knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of the Company were materially false and misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated, or acquiesced in the issuance or dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the securities laws. These defendants by virtue of their receipt of information reflecting the true facts of the Company, their control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of the Company's allegedly materially misleading statements, and/or their associations with the Company which made them privy to confidential proprietary information concerning the Company, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

36. Individual Defendants, who are the senior officers and/or directors of the Company, had actual knowledge of the material omissions and/or the falsity of the material statements set forth above, and intended to deceive Plaintiff and the other members of the Class, or, in the alternative, acted with reckless disregard for the truth when they failed to ascertain and disclose the true facts in the statements made by them or other personnel of the Company to members of the investing public, including Plaintiff and the Class.

37. As a result of the foregoing, the market price of the Company's securities were artificially inflated during the Class Period. In ignorance of the falsity of the Company's and the Individual Defendants' statements, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class relied on the statements described above and/or the integrity of the market price of the Company's securities

during the Class Period in purchasing the Company's securities at prices that were artificially inflated as a result of the Company's and the Individual Defendants' false and misleading statements.

38. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class been aware that the market price of the Company's securities had been artificially and falsely inflated by the Company's and the Individual Defendants' misleading statements and by the material adverse information which the Company's and the Individual Defendants did not disclose, they would not have purchased the Company's securities at the artificially inflated prices that they did, or at all.

39. As a result of the wrongful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff and other members of the Class have suffered damages in an amount to be established at trial.

40. By reason of the foregoing, the Company and the Individual Defendants have violated Section 10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder and are liable to the Plaintiff and the other members of the Class for substantial damages which they suffered in connection with their purchases of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

COUNT II

Violation of Section 20(a) of The Exchange Act Against The Individual Defendants

41. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

42. During the Class Period, the Individual Defendants participated in the operation and management of the Company, and conducted and participated, directly and indirectly, in the conduct of the Company's business affairs. Because of their senior positions, they knew the adverse non-public information regarding the Company's business practices.

43. As officers and/or directors of a publicly owned company, the Individual Defendants had a duty to disseminate accurate and truthful information with respect to the Company's financial condition and results of operations, and to correct promptly any public statements issued by the Company which had become materially false or misleading.

44. Because of their positions of control and authority as senior officers, the Individual Defendants were able to, and did, control the contents of the various reports, press releases and public filings which the Company disseminated in the marketplace during the Class Period. Throughout the Class Period, the Individual Defendants exercised their power and authority to cause the Company to engage in the wrongful acts complained of herein. The Individual Defendants therefore, were "controlling persons" of the Company within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. In this capacity, they participated in the unlawful conduct alleged which artificially inflated the market price of the Company's securities.

45. Each of the Individual Defendants, therefore, acted as a controlling person of the Company. By reason of their senior management positions and/or being directors of the Company, each of the Individual Defendants had the power to direct the actions of, and exercised the same to cause, the Company to engage in the unlawful acts and conduct complained of herein. Each of the Individual Defendants exercised control over the general operations of the Company and possessed the power to control the specific activities which comprise the primary violations about which Plaintiff and the other members of the Class complaint.

46. By reason of the above conduct, the Individual Defendants are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act for the violations committed by the Company.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. Determining that the instant action may be maintained as a class action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and certifying Plaintiff as the Class representative;
- B. Requiring Defendants to pay damages sustained by Plaintiff and the Class by reason of the acts and transactions alleged herein;
- C. Awarding Plaintiff and the other members of the Class prejudgment and post-judgment interest, as well as their reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees and other costs; and
- D. Awarding such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: May 24, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

By: /s/ Laurence M. Rosen
Laurence M. Rosen
609 W. South Orange Avenue, Suite 2P
South Orange, NJ 07079
Tel: (973) 313-1887
Fax: (973) 833-0399
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff